

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/737,770	12/18/2000	In-Duk Song	8733.339.00	8950
30827 75	90 05/04/2004		EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW			RUDE, TIMOTHY L	
WASHINGTON			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	
			DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/737,770	SONG, IN-DUK			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Timothy L Rude	2871			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	I) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>01 April 2004</u> . App 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 2-38.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 39 and 40.					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·			
10. Other:	SUPERVIOR TECT	DERT W. KIM CHITCATENT EXAMINER			

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/737,770

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment would merely add limitations of an auxiliary common line connected to the common electrodes from rejected base claim 1 into rejected base claim 17. Therefore, no simplification of issues would result.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments are not persuasive. It is respectfully pointed out that Applicant's arguments seem to be mainly directed at the existance of an auxiliary common line. The applied prior art has an auxiliary common line in that there are two common lines formed in a stack that reads on Applicant's invention as broadly claimed. Examiner considers Final Rejection proper because, as claimed, there are no further limitations to overcome a common line stacked on (or under) an auxiliary common line. Also, it is respectfully pointed out that comb-type common electrodes are not presently claimed.